

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-15, 18, 19, 21-25 and 27-50 remain in this application. Claims 8, 18, 25 and 28 have been amended. Claims 16 and 17 have been cancelled.

Claim 18 stands rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting. For all rejected claims, the applicant will submit a terminal disclaimer once the rejected claims are allowable over prior art.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 13-15, 19, 21-23, 25, 28-30 and 34-40 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Brown (U.S. Patent 5,794,216) in view Manson et al (U.S. Patent 5,731,997) further in view of Jones (U.S. Patent 6,748,318). Independent claims 1 and 19 recite, displaying a plurality of symbols on a map *in response to said request* for information regarding the geographic area, wherein the plurality of geographic locations are street addresses and the plurality of values are price values. Brown teaches a map having a plurality of geographic areas. Brown teaches displaying the map *to request information* regarding a geographic area, not in response to requesting information. The user interface in Figure 13 of Brown shows a map with several regions so that the user can indicate the geographic area where the user would like to purchase a house. Based upon these selected geographic area, Brown *displays a list* 212 of homes for sale in the screen shown in Figure 14 (col. 7, line 48 to col. 8, line 5). Brown does not teach displaying a map of a geographic area showing the geographic locations, or associating symbols with those locations. There is no motivation to add the map of Manson to the system of Brown, because Brown already displays the geographic locations on a list. Claims 1 and 19 are therefore patentable. Claims 2, 4-7, 13-15, and 21-23 depend from patentable claims 1 and 19 and are patentable.

Claims 8-10, 24, 27, 32-33, and 41-45 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Brown in view Manson et al further in view of Tachibana et al (U.S. Patent

6,219,053). Claims 41 and 45 recite, and 8, 25 and 28 have been amended to recite “each of the plurality of symbols having first visually identifying characteristic indicating one of a plurality of ranges of the values and a second visually identifying characteristic indicating a subrange within its associated range.” The Examiner admits that Brown and Manson do not teach associating each of a plurality of symbols with a different range of values. Tachibana also does not disclose associating different *ranges of values* with different symbols. The symbols in Tachibana are each associated with different hierarchical levels, there is no *range* of values. Additionally, Tachibana does not disclose a first characteristic associated with a hierarchy and a second characteristic associated with a subrange of that hierarchy. Even if it is assumed that each hierarchy included a *range* of values a subdivision of a hierarchy is not disclosed, or even possible, in order to obtain a subrange as claimed by the applicant. Claims 8, 25, 28, 41 and 45 are therefore patentable. Claims 9, 10, 27, 32-33, 42-44 and 46-48 depend from patentable claim 41 and 45 and are therefore patentable.

If any additional fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482 for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment. Therefore, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS

/John E. Carlson /
John E. Carlson, Reg. No. 37,794
400 W. Maple, Suite 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: June 19, 2006